



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,834	04/05/2001	Philippe Msika	065691/0215	6390

22428 7590 07/15/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER
----------

WELLS, LAUREN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/806,834

Applicant(s)

MSIKA, PHILIPPE

Examiner

Lauren Q Wells

Art Unit

1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-14 and 16-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
RUSSELL TRAVERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the phrase added to claim 1 would result in 112, second paragraph issues, and the phrase added to claim 3 would require further search and/or consideration..

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: a) the 35 USC 112 and 103 rejections are maintained for reasons of record in the Office Action mailed 2/26/03, Paper No. 9; b) Applicant argues, "While Rapaport teaches a method of treating stretchmarks, Frei teaches a method of treating skin aging, and in regard to skin care, Quelle teaches tripeptides as anti-aging factors. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that skin stretchmarks and aging have distinct etiologies". This argument is not persuasive. It is respectfully pointed out that Frei teaches the fermented soya peptide extract as increasing skin firmness, elasticity, and tone, which would treat stretch marks, as stretch marks are a result of decreased skin firmness, elasticity and tone. It is respectfully pointed out that Quelle teaches the tripeptide Gly-His-Lys as an antioxidant for use in skin care compositions and Rapaport et al. teach antioxidants as additives in his composition. Thus, one of skill would be motivated to teach the antioxidant of Quelle as the antioxidant of Rapaport. Thus, there is motivation to combine the references.